



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/783,812	02/20/2004	Barry Gammon	GAM-001CON	7060
35557	7590	06/13/2008		
CHRIS A. CASEIRO VERRILL DANA, LLP ONE PORTLAND SQUARE PORTLAND, ME 04112-0586			EXAMINER SHAKERI, HADI	
			ART UNIT 3723	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/13/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte BARRY GAMMON

Appeal 2008-1420
Application 10/783,812
Technology Center 3700

Decided: June 13, 2008

Before HUBERT C. LORIN, LINDA E. HORNER, and
MICHAEL W. O'NEILL, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

O'NEILL, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

ORDER REMANDING TO THE EXAMINER

Gammon (Appellant) seeks our review under 35 U.S.C. § 134 of the final rejection of claims 1-6. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b) (2002). This appeal includes a record that is not ripe for review and pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 41.50(a)(1) (2007), we remand this application to the

Examiner to take appropriate action consistent with our comments below.
37 C.F.R. §§ 41.35(b) and 41.50(a)(1) (2007).

The record is not ripe for review for the following reason.

The Appellant, in the Appeal Brief filed on September 15, 2006, did not respond to the Examiner's position in the Final rejection mailed on July 21, 2005, see page 6, that the declaration was insufficient to overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection, for which it was submitted. The Appellant, nevertheless, see Appeal Brief at page 8, makes a cursory cite to that same declaration during the discussion of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection. The Examiner, in the Answer, should have, but did not, then explicitly address this cursory cite to the declaration. In order to make the record clear, the Examiner should clarify whether he maintains the position he took in the Final rejection that the declaration is insufficient to overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection.

ORDER

Accordingly, it is ORDERED that the application is remanded to the Examiner:

- 1) for the Examiner to clarify the Examiner's position regarding the declaration submitted by the Appellant as Appendix B to the Appeal Brief.
- 2) for such further action as may be appropriate.

This remand to the Examiner pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 41.50(a)(1) is made for further consideration of a rejection. Accordingly, 37 C.F.R. § 41.50(a)(2) applies if a Supplemental Examiner's Answer is written in response to this remand by the Board.

REMANDED

hh

CHRIS A. CASEIRO
VERRILL DANA, LLP
ONE PORTLAND SQUARE
PORTLAND, ME 04112-0586